



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/603,998	06/25/2003	lan M. Bennett	PHO 99002CIP	4756
	7590 03/13/2007 GROSS, ATTORNEY	EXAMINER		
2030 ADDISON	-		LERNER, MARTIN	
SUITE 610 BERKELEY, CA 94704			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
DDIGEDD1, C			2626	<u> </u>
SHORTENED STATUTORY	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
31 DAYS		03/13/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summan	10/603,998	BENNETT, IAN M				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Martin Lerner	2626				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION The state of the	ON. e timely filed rom the mailing date of this communication. DNED (35 U.S.C. § 133)				
Status		•				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
·						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims	•					
4)⊠ Claim(s) 1 to 28 is/are pending in the application	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 to 28</u> is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)⊠ Claim(s) 1 to 28 are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner	r.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce		e Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
·						
Attachment(s)						
—						
Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
5) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)						
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:						

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The Information Disclosure Statement filed 01 March 2004 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed.

The Information Disclosure Statement filed 01 March 2004 fails to provide copies of two of the Other Publications: Creative Labs (VoiceAssist.TM. "User's Guide" © July 1993) and 21st Century Eloquence, Inc. (Archived Internet advertisement © 1997 1998). Accordingly, these references are lined through to indicate they were not considered on the Form 1449/PTO.

Election/Restrictions

- 2. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - Claims 1 to 17, drawn to an interactive system and method for responding to speech-based queries, comprising, storing a plurality of topic query entries in a query file, storing a plurality of topic answer entries to one or more topic query entries in an answer file, generating recognized speech utterance data associated with a speech-based query from partially processed speech data with a speech recognition system, converting said recognized speech utterance data with a natural language engine using

both semantic decoding and statistical based processing, and locating at least one topic answer entry best matching said speech-based query with a query formulation system, classified in class 707, subclass 3.

- II. Claims 18 to 25, drawn to a method of performing semantic decoding of a user question, comprising, receiving a set of words forming a user question at a networked online natural language processing system, determining a frequency of occurrence of one or more terms identified in the user question and in each of one or more known queries, determining a percentage of terms which appear in the user question that also appear in each of the one or more known queries, and measuring a semantic similarity between said set of words in the user question and a corresponding set of words in each of the one or more known queries, classified in class 704, subclass 257.
- III. Claims 26 to 28, drawn to a method of populating a natural language speech lattice with semantically variant questions, comprising, receiving a user question, determining synonyms for each of the words in the user question, formulating a random set of questions based on the synonyms, and performing semantic decoding on the random set of questions to identify a disambiguated set of questions, classified in class 704, subclass 9.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

3. Inventions I and II are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, Invention I has separate utility such as for a speech recognition system and method utilizing a natural language engine performing both semantic decoding and statistical based processing. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Inventions II and III are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, Invention II has separate utility such as for a method of semantic decoding that determines a meaning from a frequency of occurrence of one or more terms and a percentage of terms that appear in both the user question and in each of one or more known queries. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Inventions I and III are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, Invention III has separate utility such as for a method of populating a natural language speech lattice by determining synonyms for each of a plurality of words in a user question, and formulating a random set of questions based on the synonyms. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

The examiner has required restriction between subcombinations usable together.

Where Applicant elects a subcombination and claims thereto are subsequently found

Application/Control Number: 10/603,998

Art Unit: 2626

allowable, any claims depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

- 4. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 5. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not

distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should Applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, Applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Martin Lerner whose telephone number is (571) 272-7608. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM to 6:00 PM Monday to Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David R. Hudspeth can be reached on (571) 272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ML 3/6/07

Martin Lerner

Examiner

Group Art Unit 2626